EFFECTS OF CONFIDENT AND DIFFIDENT ROLE-PLAYING ON SELF-EVALUATION, PERCEIVED EVALUATION, AND BEHAVIORAL MEASURES

By

JOHN KENNETH REID

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1967

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1971

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 1975

EFFECTS OF CONFIDENT AND DIFFIDENT ROLE-PLAYING ON SELF-EVALUATION, PERCEIVED EVALUATION, AND BEHAVIORAL MEASURES

Thesis Approved:

Donald K. Fromme
Thesis Adviser

Judith E. Dobson

Kenneth P. Sandvold

William C. Scott

N. N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am sincerely grateful to all the members of my committee. The Chairman, Dr. Donald Fromme, provided helpful suggestions and encouragement during all phases of the study, and his efforts on the final draft were most helpful. Dr. William Scott's extensive and careful comments on an early draft and his suggestions on methodology contributed significantly. Dr. Kenneth Sandvold and Dr. Judith Dodson also were very helpful and encouraging.

I also wish to thank Dr. Elliot Weiner for his comments on the first draft and Dr. Barbara Weiner for statistical consultation. Acquiring subjects was facilitated through the kind cooperation of Joe Ward and Craig Johnson. I particularly wish to thank Bob Weinberger and Bob Graalman who expended much effort on final details necessary for completion of this project. Finally, I appreciate the efficient typing done by Mrs. C. O. Grace.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Purpose of the Study

As early as 1920, J. L. Moreno was advocating psychodrama or role-playing as an effective psychotherapeutic method. In recent years, role-playing has become an integral part of many other therapeutic approaches, such as Gestalt therapy and encounter groups. Role-playing also has been utilized successfully in the field of education, as a training technique in business and industry, and as an alternative to deceiving subjects in psychological research. Studies from many of these areas will be discussed here, but the major objective will be to investigate the effect of role-playing on self-confidence. More specifically, this study will attempt to determine: (1) if playing a confident role, in contrast to a diffident role, will lead to an enhancement of personal confidence; (2) if this difference in self-confidence is measurable both with a post-task self-evaluation by the subject and with behavioral indices of which the subject is unaware; (3) if one who is observed in a confident role, as opposed to a diffident role, will be perceived by others as more potent, more active, and more favorably.

As the literature which applies to this topic is extensive and widely-varied, a systematic approach is necessary. The review will be presented in three major areas: first, several articles which have reported an improvement in self-concept following a role-playing

experience (many had other primary goals, and most are in the Moreno tradition of therapy case studies rather than research projects); second, a body of empirical studies in the area of attitude change through role-playing; and third, the few empirical studies which have been done concerning the enhancement of interpersonal skills (closely associated with self-confidence) through role-playing or a similar technique. Organizing the review in this manner will have two results: (1) the material will progress on a continuum from theoretical to empirical; (2) the material will progress on a continuum of that moderately related to this study to material which is very closely related. The chapter will close with conclusions which can be drawn from the overall review, a discussion of the application of these conclusions, and a brief summary.

Case Studies Which Found Enhanced Self-confidence Following Role-playing Experience

Friendman (1970) reported on the long-term use of role-playing to aid in training economically and socially deprived adolescents in a youth employment office. Role-playing was found to be an excellent way to develop verbal facility in persons with an inadequate education. In contrast to formal education, role-playing was appealing to lower status youths because of the physical action it implied and its use of concrete situations. The main obstacle for ghetto youths seeking employment was a lack of self-confidence developing form the absence of social and verbal skills. Role-playing proved to be an effective means of achieving success in these areas and gradually improving the self-concept.

Newburger (1970) worked with a speech class at a metropolitan community college under open admissions. In addition to speech training,

each student was assigned to one of three groups. One group participated in group discussions, the second group had an equal number of role-playing sessions with the speech teacher, and the third group had the same number of role-playing sessions with an "expert" role-playing therapist. After six sessions, only the group working with the expert role-player showed improvement in speech-giving according to peer ratings, but both role-playing groups had a 5% improvement in self-evaluation (subjective feelings about their own ability). These results were considered noteworthy because many role-play therapists believe a minimum of fifteen sessions are necessary for role training to be effective.

Therapists with varying styles and approaches have found that when their clients participate in role-playing during therapy, one frequent result is enhanced self-confidence. Case studies of this type were reported by Jones (1969), Schaeffer and Von Nessen (1968), Krumboltz and Thoreson (1969), Boylin (1971), and Wolf and Hall (1971). In the last cited study, role-playing was utilized to work through a traumatic incident with a hospitalized patient. The individual initially was so withdrawn and inhibited, he could not even describe his symptoms to the therapist. Over the course of several weeks, he resolved his personal conflict through psychodrama in which he assumed the roles of major protagonists in the original conflict. It was noted that from the beginning of role-playing, a noticeable enhancement of the patient's self-concept and social confidence occurred. This increase was so dramatic that he began to interact with other patients in the ward for the first time.

In summary, several studies found improvement in self-confidence, or a very similar characteristic, following therapeutic role-playing

in group and individual settings.

Attitude Change through Role-playing

These studies deal with attitude or opinion change on "public" topics, rather than a change in feelings about self. However, this section is of a more empirical nature than the previously reviewed studies, and will allow generalizations to the main topic of this paper with more confidence. Goffman (1959) discussed the self-convincing effects of a behavior closely related to role-playing, that of managing one's impressions in front of others. He reported that in primitive societies the world over, shamans or medicine men increase their ability to cure with sleight-of-hand and fraudulent exhibitions of power. Initially, the shaman's exhibition of "magical powers" is just a pretense for others, but eventually he begins to believe in his power and in that of other shamans. He consults other shamans fervently when he or his children are ill. In other words, he has changed his own attitude about shamans to coincide with what was formerly just a role he was playing. Role-playing has led to an attitude change.

One of the first major research projects in this area was conducted by Janis and King (1954). As a preliminary, they interviewed students who, in their role as collegiate debators, were often required to play a role in which they publicly expressed views that did not correspond to their personal opinions. Most reported they frequently ended up personally in agreement with positions they had been arbitrarily assigned to defend. Following this lead, the actual experiment was designed to determine if overt verbalization, induced by role-playing, facilitates opinion change. Three current social-political topics were chosen.

Each active participant, utilizing a prepared outline, played the role of a sincere advocate of a given point of view on one of the topics. Passive controls silently read and listened to the same communication. A measure of opinion was obtained from all participants at the end of the session and was compared with a "before" measure obtained one month earlier. It was found that the active role-players significantly altered their personal opinions in the direction of their public persuasive arguments. On two of the three topics there was significantly more opinion change by the active role-players; on the third topic (one which dealt with detailed, difficult information) no significant difference in opinion change occurred, but the role-players significantly increased their level of confidence. In attempting to explain their results, the authors speculated that the amount of improvisation and/or the amount of satisfaction with their performance had been major factors in differentiating the two groups.

To better specify the underlying variables, King and Janis (1956) conducted a follow-up study. By manipulating the amounts of improvisation and satisfaction for different groups, it was determined that the improvisation factor was responsible for producing significant enhancement of the acceptance of the persuasive communication. That is, only subjects (Ss) who were required to improvise while role-playing showed a significant change in opinion. The level of satisfaction with their performance had no appreciable effect. Kelman (1953) also had previously determined that those subjects with increased amounts of spontaneous elaborations and additions in their persuasive arguments significantly increased their own opinion change. In explaining these results, King and Janis (1956) pointed out that a lowering of psychological resistance occurs when one

regards a persuasive argument as his "own" idea. When one is presented with a direct suggestion from others, resentment or other negativistic factors may interfere with acceptance. However, if an individual believes he is making a decision on his own initiative, negativistic factors do not interfere. He is more accepting, and thus more influenced, as a result of indirect suggestion. This same resistance to direct suggestion has been commonly advanced as a major reason for the effectiveness of nondirective or Rogerian psychotherapy. The authors conclude, "In effect, the customer is not simply asked to examine ready-made material in an original communication, but is given scissors, needle, and thread to hand-tailor the material to suit himself" (p. 184). A similar and supporting study also was completed more recently by Greenwald and Albert (1968). Finally, Matefy (1972) determined that "moderate" improvisation, in which the S had some familiarity with the role and/or a prepared outline, was more effective than that which required "maximum" improvisation.

Several other researchers investigating a widely-varied range of hypotheses with very different experimental designs have also found evidence that playing a role leads to an attitude change consistent with the role. Rogers (1969) found a positive change in high school students' attitudes toward counseling and guidance after systematic application of role-playing techniques. The change was particularly convincing as it was measured not just by a questionnaire, but also by an increase in the number of written requests and self-referrals for guidance from the students. Leshner (1967) compared multiple role-playing, group discussion, and a control group under a variety of conditions and concluded that multiple role-playing is an effective attitude changing technique

and is significantly more effective than group discussion. Watts (1967) investigated the long-term effect of attitude change induced either by actively playing a role or by passively receiving arguments. Through pre-study and modification of the persuasive messages, the immediate effects of the two conditions were equated. At the end of six weeks the active-participation condition showed clear superiority in amount of change. Active participation also resulted in greater discussion of, reading about, and superior recall of the topic.

Other researchers who have obtained similar general results have felt that the amount of emotional involvement in the role-playing was a factor of major importance. That is, rather than having Ss simply write out an argument while pretending this was their own attitude (a technique utilized in a few of the studies previously mentioned), "emotional" role-playing might consist of using props, costumes, a realistic setting, and other individuals with whom to play scenes. In an experiment by Keutzer, Lichtenstein, and Hines (1969), Ss who smoked were asked to play the role of patients being told they had lung cancer. The experimenter donned a white medical coat, and after each "patient" completed a four-minute soliloquy in the waiting room (reflecting on the impending diagnosis), he was taken into an office which resembled a doctor's office. He was then told his X-rays indicated lung cancer. The arrangements for and personal implications of hospitalization were discussed, and the S listened while the "doctor" made hospital arrangements by telephone. The S then soliloquized while the physician "worked on his case notes." Finally, the patient and the doctor discussed causes of lung cancer. In this particular study, results for the role-players and a group of controls, who simply heard a tape of all of the above procedure, were not

significantly different. However, a study by Janis and Mann (1965), with only slight differences in the role-played scene (role-players pretended to already know they had lung cancer, and the "physician" gave them the news it would be fatal), resulted in significant differences in both attitude and smoking rate for the "emotional" role-players. Furthermore, the role-players still reported greater smoking reduction than did the controls when a follow-up study was conducted 18 months later (Mann and Janis, 1968). These results were also supported by similar studies on the same general topic (Elms, 1966; Mann, 1967).

Levy and Atkins (1969) further explored "emotional" role-playing with a different topic. Their Ss were females from a church related college, where student opinion was overwhelmingly against interfaith marriages. Each "active role-player" was asked to imagine she had been dating and had decided to marry a boy from outside her religion. She then described to a female confederate how she resolved her conflicts and reached her decision. In contrast, "passive role-players" simply read to a confederate a statement, written by a girl who decided to marry outside her faith, which described her conflicts and resolution. When compared to the passive role-players and to a group of controls, the active role-players demonstrated a significantly higher degree of emotional involvement and attitude change. This change was transitory; in a follow-up measure two weeks later, attitudes had shifted back to their original position. However, the authors noted that if permanent change is to occur, a new, unstable belief must be anchored in the individual's social setting with social reinforcement. This was not possible in this particular situation because the rest of the student body was opposed to interfaith marriage.

Janis and Gilmore (1965) found that college students were influenced to change attitudes by the belief that they were aiding a respectable experimenter. Subjects who accepted a role-playing task at the request of a prestigeful social scientist subsequently displayed significant attitude change consistent with the role-playing. Another role-playing group who believed they were aiding a less favorably regarded individual with purely commercial motivation did not. That is, role-players were markedly more influenced when the sponsor's affiliations and goals were presented as being highly regarded or consonant with their (the students') own values, than when they were presented as being more dissonant.

In summary of this section, research has been presented to indicate that under certain conditions, role-playing leads to attitude change consistent with the role played. This seems to be enhanced if: (1) active, verbal role-playing is utilized, rather than the more passive essay-writing technique; (2) a moderate degree of inventive improvisation is required; (3) the role elicits emotional involvement; (4) and the director's affiliations and goals are consistent with the subject who is enacting the role or highly regarded by the subject.

Enhancement of Interpersonal Skills through Role-playing or a Similar Technique

This section, in contrast to the preceding section, consists of studies which attempted to modify personal characteristics or interpersonal skills, rather than simply changing an attitude or opinion. Sanders (1968) used role-playing effectively to reduce public speaking anxiety. He also found two components of role-playing, both of which he considered important in achieving maximum effect. Imaginal desensitization

consists of imagining oneself in the anxiety arousing situation or in one where the desired behavior will occur. Behavior rehearsal consists simply of rehearsing the specific behavior to be enacted in the situation, in this case, giving a speech. Although the latter was slightly more important, maximum effects resulted when both occurred together. Sanders evaluated individuals following a series of role-playing therapy sessions. He found that success in reducing anxiety was ultimately associated both with anxiety in therapy and with confidence in therapy. He concluded that each role-playing situation should include both tasks which challenge and those at which one feels confident.

Friedman (1969) studied the effects of different types of role-playing to increase assertive verbal behavior of college students. He found a combination of modeling and role-playing to be most effective initially. On follow-up two weeks later, there was a sex by treatment interaction. For males the combination modeling-and-role-playing group still demonstrated the most change, but for females the group which had experienced improvised role-playing evidenced the better result.

Gergen (1965), while conducting a study on self-presentation, noted that marked changes in a person's private self image resulted from his publicly presenting a very positive self image. During one phase, subjects were told they would be interviewed by an assistant who was learning interviewing skills. They were instructed either to be accurate about themselves or to try to make an unusually good impression. Later evaluation showed that the "good impression" group reported higher self-regard. Gergen speculated that playing a positive role brought to mind many more positive features of an individual's own personality. However, it is possible that subjects responded to the demand characteristics of

of the situation and simply rated themselves positively because they had just been asked to appear positive. Gergen did not include any unobtrusive or behavioral measures to support his subjects' subjective reports.

In a few cases, similar results have been reported even without a formal role-playing exercise. Although these studies obviously do not illustrate results of role-playing, they do evidence the possibility of enhancing self-confidence with methods which are very similar. In a follow-up study to the above, Gergen and Gibbs (1965) reported that a subject's self image could be improved by simply having the person think about positive aspects of himself. Similarly, Homme (1965) demonstrated that self-confidence could be increased through "coverant control." Homme had a subject compile a list of reasons why he should be confident. He was then required to think about this list before reinforcing himself with a "high probability behavior" (HPB). The HPB was specific for each subject, but common examples were lighting a cigarette or getting a cup of coffee. Homme reported that this technique significantly increased the frequency of self-confident thoughts. Cautela (1969) reported similar results with his closely related technique of "covert reinforcement." He had a patient think of a confident or assertive behavior or verbalization. Immediately afterward, the individual was instructed to reinforce himself with images, which were previously established as reinforcing. Cautela stated that this technique has aided a great many patients with serious deficiencies in their self-concept.

Conclusions

The case studies in the first section of this review indicated that in a variety of different situations, enhanced self-confidence has been

associated with a role-playing experience. In many of these studies, this was not a specific goal and occurred almost as a side effect. The second section reported on specific techniques which, when utilized in role-playing, have led to attitude change, although these studies were not concerned with attitude about self. It would follow that a role-playing experience with the specific goal of changing the attitude about self in a positive or self-confident direction should be even more effective. This conclusion was supported by the third section which reported a few achievements in this general area, i.e., enhancing interpersonal skills via role-playing or similar techniques, thus more closely approximating the intent of the present study. The work of Gergen and Gibbs (1965) and Homme (1965) indicated that simply concentrating on positive aspects of self led to some enhancement of self-confidence. However, these studies were not examples of active, emotionally-involving role-playing, which is of primary interest in this paper and which might be of more practical interest to a psychotherapist. Further, these and other studies in the third section ignored most of the specific techniques which enhance the effects of role-playing, and no previous study has combined all of the important techniques reviewed here. Finally, dependent variables in the above studies typically were based only on subjective reports of the subjects recorded on paper-and-pencil scales, and demand characteristics may have influenced results.

In reaching an overview, it seemed important not only to combine the information derived from the results of all three sections, but to avoid certain weak points of the reviewed studies. Therefore, it was predicted that a realistic and emotionally involving role-playing experience, which caused one to concentrate on confident thoughts and

behaviors, and which utilized all the potentiating techniques from the attitude change literature, should yield a strong and significant enhanced self-confidence effect. This effect should be of sufficient magnitude to be measurable, with a variety of dependent variables, and thus would allow more confidence in generalizing to the real world.

Application

This section will briefly present the application of the above review and conclusions, noting the most important previous research and its specific relationship to the present study. A review of the non-verbal dependent variables utilized in this study also will be included here.

As previously stated, Janis and Gilmore (1965) found more attitude change when subjects believed they were aiding respectable social science research. For this reason, when each subject initially reported to the experimental room, she was given a short talk explaining a few of the potential practical uses for research of this type (e.g., in therapy with hospitalized patients). Next, the S was thoroughly briefed and "coached" on the role-playing situation. Each subject assumed the role of either an extremely confident individual or an extremely diffident individual. Further, as a premise for the scene and to elicit the more effective "emotional" role-playing (Keutzer, Lichtenstein, and Hines, 1969; Janis and Mann, 1965; Levy and Atkins, 1969), each S was asked to imagine she had come to see her child's teacher to discuss the child's progress in school. An experimental assistant served as the teacher to add realism, and the experimental room was set up to resemble a teacher's office. Ss were encouraged to utilize "imaginal desensitization"

(Sanders, 1968). A pilot study indicated that undergraduate females were able to perform this role comfortably and were able to imagine this scene actually happening to them in real life. Another scene in which the subject pretended to be interviewing for a job had been discarded following a pilot study, as few college females felt they had sufficient experience to be comfortable in this role. An outline of possible topics for the conversation was provided. The outline facilitated the subject's task, but still required improvisation as suggested by Matefy (1972).

A video-tape was made of each subject's role-playing. This allowed judges to rate each S on several behavioral measures: standing personal space, seated personal space, eye contact, postural openness, and verbosity. Personal space can be defined as the area surrounding a person's body into which intruders may not come (Sommer, 1969). Booraem and Flowers (1972) found that severely disturbed psychiatric inpatients required greater personal space. Following therapeutic assertive training, they required less personal space. Several other investigators determined that individuals with significant emotional problems require more personal space (Duke and Mullens, 1973; Horowitz, 1968; Luft, 1966). Eberts (1972) found that individuals who lived alone and had lower self-acceptance scores preferred greater personal space. Duke and Norwicki (1972) found that when interacting with strangers, individuals who felt less certain of their ability to control the situation preferred greater personal space. Dosey and Meisels (1969) reported that when persons experience significant stress, they exhibit greater personal-space zones. Conversely, individuals who wish to communicate a positive or friendly attitude chose a smaller interpersonal distance (Porter, Argyle, and Salter, 1970; Rosenfeld, 1965; Sommer, 1967). Other investigators

determined that extroverts need less personal space than introverts (Patterson and Holmes, 1966; and Patterson and Sechrest, 1970). Butt and Fiske (1968) found that individuals who are more dominant exhibit less personal space. Fromme and Beam (1974) found that women also express high dominance through higher levels of eye contact than low dominant women. Several other investigators have found that higher degrees of eye contact are associated with higher dominant needs (Argyle, 1969; Strongman and Champness, 1968; Cranach, 1971), while gaze aversion has been found to represent submission (Altmann, 1967; Chance, 1962). Positive attitudes also have been linked to high eye contact (Mehrabian, 1968, 1971), and subjects whose self-esteem was diminished by an experimenter avoided eye contact with him (Exline and Winters, 1965). With regard to postural openness, Mehrabian (1968) and Poling (1974) found that individuals who are less threatened maintain a more open posture (less crossing of arms and legs in front of the body).

In view of all the above, it was expected that during this role-playing experience, the confident role-players would exhibit significantly smaller amounts of standing and seated personal space, and significantly greater amounts of eye contact, postural openness, and verbosity than subjects in the diffident role-playing condition. Ss were assumed to be naive with respect to these variables. They were not expected to be consciously acting out these characteristics as part of their "performances." Therefore, differences on these behavioral measures would indicate not only that Ss were "emotionally" involved in the role-playing exercise, but that the role-playing was having an effect on their behavior and presumably their corresponding internal experiences. If results on these behavioral measures were in agreement with a subject's

subjective report of how he felt, it could be concluded more confidently that there was a genuine treatment effect.

Next, judges also viewed a video-tape of each subject's complete performance. They rated the overall effectiveness of the performance and the "true" personality of the subject, as they perceived it to be outside of the role, on a set of semantic differentials which tapped potency, activity, and evaluation (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957). Significantly higher scores for the confident role-players would have indicated: (1) that one who plays a confident role is perceived as more effective, more potent, more active, and is more favorably evaluated; and (2) that Ss were sufficiently involved in their roles that they were affecting differentially the manners in which they were perceived. Significant results on these variables also would indicate that a temporary or mood change on the part of a subject following role-playing could be perceived and potentially positively reinforced by others in his social environment. Levy and Atkins (1969) stated that if permanent change is to occur, a new, unstable belief must be anchored in the individual's social setting with social reinforcement.

Finally, immediately following the role-playing, each S completed Maslow's S-I Inventory (SII). This produced a post-task measure of self-confidence to compare with scores from the version acquired in a large class-room administration several weeks earlier. A significant increase from pre- to post-trial on the SII for the confident role-player was predicted and would indicate that simply playing the confident role had enhanced personal self-confidence. Conversely, a significant decrease from pre- to post-trial on the SII for the diffident role-players was predicted and would indicate that their personal confidence had been

lessened by the role-playing experience.

Summary of the Problem

Previous literature indicated that under certain conditions, role-playing has enhanced self-confidence or a similar characteristic. Research of a slightly different nature showed that many specific techniques can increase the potential for role-playing to change attitudes. This study combined many of these attitude change techniques in one role-playing experience in order to change the attitude about self. The primary goal was to show that role-playing a confident role will lead to enhanced self-confidence. However, for contrast, another group role-played a diffident role, and a decrease in self-confidence was expected. Naturally, in this experimental setting subjects were thoroughly debriefed after the last dependent variable was administered, so any effects would be short-lived. Also, as Levy and Atkins (1969) noted, social reinforcement would be necessary to support a behavior change, and it seemed unlikely that diffident responses would receive long-term positive reinforcement.

The effects on the subjects of both the confident and the diffident role-playing was measured in three distinct manners: (1) behavioral measures which included standing and seated personal space, eye contact, postural openness, and verbosity were recorded; (2) after observing a video-tape of each subject's performance, judges rated each on a variety of semantic differentials which determined perceived potency, activity, evaluation, and overall effectiveness of the performance; (3) each S rated her own self-confidence on a self evaluative scale and pre- and post-trial measures were compared.

It was predicted that subjects who played the confident role, as opposed to those who played the diffident role: (1) would evidence less personal space, and more eye contact, postural openness, and verbosity; (2) would be perceived by observers as more potent, active, and more favorably evaluated; (3) would rate themselves higher in self-confidence following the role-playing than they did on the pre-experiment rating.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

In the first phase of the study, the Empathic Fantasy Scale (EFS) (see Appendix A) and a shortened version of Maslow's Security-Insecurity Inventory (SII) (Maslow, Birsh, Stein, and Honigman, 1945) (see Appendix B) were administered to a total of 215 students in four Introductory Psychology classes at Oklahoma State University. The EFS had been found to correlate highly with judges' ratings of overt role-playing ability (Elms, 1966). Matefy (1972) also found that high scorers on the EFS show greater adoption of the role-played position. In a pilot study and in this administration of the EFS, females scored significantly higher (see Appendix F). In addition, Friedman (1969) found that improvised role-playing was more effective with females, in contrast to a two-part modeling and role-playing exercise which was more effective with males. For these reasons, and in order to simplify interactions during role-playing scenes, it was decided to use exclusively female subjects. To insure that all participating subjects initially had comparable ability to receive treatment effects, those grouped at the top of the range were chosen. Of the original 215 students (male and female), 106 were female and willing to participate in an out-of-class experiment. From this latter group, 24 of the highest-scoring females who could meet during the scheduled experimental hours were chosen. Data from four subjects

were lost because of problems in video-tape recording, so twenty were used in calculations, ten per treatment group. All scored higher than the 75th percentile of the all-female group. Two to three weeks after the initial large-group testing, each subject was contacted by telephone and told only that from the class-room administration of the EFS and SII, she had been randomly selected to participate in a study on "communication." All subjects were English-speaking Caucasians and were participating to earn extra credit in Introductory Psychology (none were from classes taught by the experimenter). Ages ranged from 18 to 23 years with a median of 20.5 years.

Experimental Assistants

Three female assistants played the role of "teacher" to facilitate the role-played parent-teacher conference, each with approximately one-third of the subjects. Their ages were 18, 19, and 21 years. All were of approximately average height and build. Their grooming and dress were in keeping with campus styles. Each was able to interact with subjects in a friendly and relaxed manner and was helpful in putting the subject at ease when she first arrived. Each assistant had been trained for an hour and had interacted with three pre-study subjects before the experiment. An attempt was made to standardize the assistant's part of the interaction as much as possible during the actual role-played scene. The assistant not only allowed the subject to direct the conversation, but also verbalized only in an interested but non-directive manner ("I see...Uh-huh...I understand").

Four males and three females served as judges. Their ages ranged from 18 to 22 years with a median of 20.5 years. Each judge was trained

for approximately a half hour and "practiced" on three pre-study subjects before the experiment. They were told nothing about the overall study or the application of their judgments. All were assumed to be naive concerning the major hypotheses of the study.

All assistants and judges were volunteers from the experimenter's Introductory Psychology class, and all ranked in the top one-third of that class academically. Their participation was part of a special project for extra credit.

Procedure

Upon arriving, each subject was introduced to the experimental assistant with whom she would be role-playing. A few minutes of casual conversation between the two was encouraged so that the subject would feel more at ease with the assistant and with the surroundings. The potential practical application of psychological research was briefly discussed and the subject was thanked in advance for her help. The subject was then "coached" for the role she was to play. Each odd-numbered subject was given instructions to be an extremely <u>confident</u> individual, as follows:

> You will pretend to be an extremely confident individual -- very sure of yourself, assertive, the type who always seems to know just what to do and say, and who never seems lacking in confidence or ill at ease. You probably have known people like this and may feel this way yourself at times. Since you will be trying to communicate this characterization in only a few minutes you will need to exaggerate greatly these characteristics. Take a few minutes to think about what you might do and say and how you might feel. Try to actually "become" the person I have been describing.

Each even-numbered subject was given instructions to be an extremely <u>diffident</u> individual, as follows:

> You will pretend to be an extremely diffident or unconfident individual -- very unsure of yourself, passive, the type who never seems to know what to do and say, and who always seems lacking in confidence or ill at ease. You probably have known people like this and may feel this way yourself at times. Since you will be trying to communicate this characterization in only a few minutes you will need to exaggerate greatly these characteristics. Take a few minutes to think about what you might do and say and how you might feel. Try to actually "become" the person I have been describing.

All subjects then were given the same outline for a parent-teacher conference (see Appendix C) and identical instructions for the main premise of the role-playing scene, as follows:

> You will pretend to be the mother of a child in the fourth-grade. You have come here to the teacher's office for a regular yearly parent-teacher conference. The topic of discussion will be what you like or dislike about the education your child is getting and the way he is being taught. My assistant will play the role of the teacher. However, in a sense, she is just a "prop" to allow you to play the role more easily. She will be very non-directive and will allow you to initiate most of what is said. She will just try to be a "good listener." Talk about whatever you like. You may use the outline, just your own ideas, or a combination of both. Try to make the interview last five or ten minutes and conclude it yourself when you feel ready. Although the room you will be using contains little besides two chairs, it may help to imagine you are actually in a teacher's office with a desk, bookcase, and children's drawings on the walls. Do you have any questions? Take a few minutes to imagine yourself playing this role and what you will do and say. Be sure and remember the previous instructions about the type of personality you will be portraying.

When the subject felt prepared, she was instructed to knock on the door of the "teacher's office." This room was 10 x 12 feet and contained only two chairs.

Standing Personal Space was determined first. Upon entering, the subject saw the "teacher" standing in the far corner of the room. The point to which she initially approached the teacher was observed by another assistant through a one-way mirror which paralleled her entrance.

This measurement was for nose-to-nose distance in inches and was facilitated by inconspicuous markings at six inch intervals on the wall opposite the mirror.

The "teacher" then seated herself and instructed the subject, "Please pull up a chair." The distance in inches between the center of the two chairs, measured after the subject's departure, determined Seated Personal Space.

When seated during the role-playing scene, the subject was almost directly facing the one-way mirror. Although the subject had been told she could be observed by the experimenter, she did not know that a videotape was being made of her performance. Immediately following the scene's conclusion, each subject again completed a shortened version of Maslow's S-I Inventory (SII) (Maslow, Birsh, Stein, and Honigman, 1945) (see Appendix B). It was emphasized at this point that the role-playing was finished and that responses should reflect true feelings, not further role-playing. Next, each subject was debriefed. Considerable time and care were taken in debriefing to insure that there was no negative carry-over from the role-playing before the subject was dismissed. This SII score was compared to each subject's score on the same test acquired in the large classroom administration three weeks earlier. The SII scale distinguishes confident or "secure" individuals from those who are lacking in confidence or "insecure." It had particular application here because of its sensitivity not only to characterological differences but also to superficial or "mood" differences. The difference expected in self-confidence between the pre-trial and post-trial measures was primarily one of mood. The simplified scoring system developed by Gough (1948) was employed. The difference in scores from the two

administrations was considered a measure of Change in Self-Confidence resulting from the role-playing.

The video-tapes later were scored by two judges for Eye Contact and Postural Openness. The video-camera had been behind the one-way mirror and in back of the assistant. Each subject was filmed over the assistant's right shoulder and was facing and looking almost directly into the camera. The assistant (playing the role of "teacher") was instructed to gaze directly into the subject's eyes throughout the scene. For the eye contact measure, two judges working independently utilized stopwatches to measure the number of seconds during the first three minutes that the subject returned this eye contact. The average of the two judges was the final eye contact measure for each subject. There was high inter-judge agreement (Pearson r = .98). Similarly, two judges working independently determined postural openness scores for each subject which combined degree of openness and time in that position. That is, for the first five minutes of the scene, a judge assigned a numerical rating of one through four (according to pre-arranged criteria) for varying positions of both arms and legs. These ranged from totally closed (Score of one--Arms interlocked across front of the body) to totally open (Score of four--Neither arm folded across the front of the body). See Appendix D for details on scoring categories and instructions to judges. The score for a position was multiplied by the number of seconds that position was maintained (calculated by the same judges with stopwatches), and these products were summed to obtain a single score for arm openness for each subject. The whole procedure was repeated to determine leg openness for each subject, and the arm and leg openness scores then were summed to attain an overall Amount of Openness score

per subject for each judge. In addition, the total number of times a subject shifted positions was recorded (both arms and legs), and a Total Number of Changes value was calculated per subject for each judge. As on Eye Contact, the final values used in the t-tests were the averages for each subject of the two judges working independently. Again there was high inter-judge agreement (Pearson r = .88). Verbosity was simply a measure of the total length of time in seconds that each subject spoke (each subject had been instructed to conclude the scene with the "teacher" whenever she felt it appropriate).

Finally, two different judges viewed each subject's video-taped performance and then rated Overall Effectiveness of the performance. They also evaluated the individual's "true" personality, as they perceived she would have been when not role-playing, with semantic differentials designed to measure Potency, Activity, and Evaluation (see Appendix E). For this task, the judges (in contrast to the two previous judges) were told of the specific instructions the subject had received and knew whether she was playing a confident or diffident role. In each case, the final score for each subject was the average of two judges working independently. Inter-judge agreement reflected the more subjective nature of the data, relative to previous measures, but remained good (Pearson r's for Overall Effectiveness, Potency, Activity, and Evaluation were, respectively, .69, .74, .41, and .68).

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

A two-factor repeated-measures split-plot design (Kirk, 1968) was performed on data from the Security-Insecurity Inventory (SII). Factor A, the type of role-playing a subject performed, had two levels, a_1 = Confident and a_2 = Diffident. Factor B, the point during the experiment at which an SII measure was taken, also had two levels, b_1 = Pre- and b_2 = Post-. Results conformed to predictions. Table I shows that the AB factor, the interaction of the type of role-playing with when the SII measure was taken, was significant beyond the .05 level. Stated another way, this meant that one factor behaved differently under different levels of the other factor. Therefore, the analysis proceeded to tests of simple main effects.

Results of the simple main effects tests are presented in Table II. Results again conformed to predictions. A at b_1 was not significant, indicating that prior to the experiment there were not significant differences between the Confident and Diffident groups (Confident mean was 30.3, s.d. 4.92; Diffident mean was 29.8, s.d. 7.13). A at b_2 was highly significant (beyond the .01 level). This evidences that following the role-playing experiment, the Confident group scored much higher than the Diffident group on the SII (Confident mean was 32.8, s.d. 4.85; Diffident mean was 28.2, s.d. 8.24). B at a_1 was significant at the .05 level, so within the Confident group itself, there occurred a significant enhance-

ment on the SII when Pre- scores were compared to Post- (Pre- mean equaled 30.3, s.d. 4.92; Post- mean was 32.8, s.d. 4.85). However, B at a_2, while changing in the predicted direction, was not significant at the .05 level. That is, although the Diffident group's SII measure was decreased following the role-playing experiment, the alteration did not reach significance (Pre- mean was 29.8, s.d. 7.13; Post- mean was 28.2, s.d. 8.24). All means and standard deviations are presented in Table III.

TABLE I

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SII MEASURE

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Subjects	1512.975	19		
A (type of role-playing)	65.025	1	65.025	.808
Subjects within groups	1447.950	18	80.442	
Within Subjects	143.000	20		
B (when measured)	2.025	1	2.025	.368
AB	42.025	1	42.025	7.645*
B x subjects within groups	98.950	18	5.497	

*Significant at the .05 level ($F_{critical}$ for .05 = 4.41).

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SIMPLE EFFECTS
FOR SII MEASURE

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Subjects				
Between A at b_1	1.250	1	1.250	1.047
Between A at b_2	105.800	1	105.800	88.610**
Within Cell	42.969	36	1.194	
Within Subjects				
Between B at a_1	31.250	1	31.250	5.685*
Between B at a_2	12.800	1	12.800	2.329
AB	42.025	1	42.025	7.645*
B x subjects within groups	98.950	18	5.497	

* Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE III

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR
SII MEASURE

Condition	Mean		Standard Deviation	
	Confident	Diffident	Confident	Diffident
PRE-	30.3	29.8	4.92	7.13
POST-	32.8	28.2	4.85	8.24

Since there were no Pre-measures on the remaining dependent variables, Confident and Diffident groups were compared in each case with a one-tailed t test for small groups (Hays, 1963). Means and standard deviations are presented in Tables IV and V. Results from t-tests are presented in Tables VI and VII.

TABLE IV

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR BEHAVIORAL MEASURES

Measures	Mean		Standard Deviation	
	Confident	Diffident	Confident	Diffident
STANDING PS (inches)	48.600	105.000	16.000	24.620
SEATED PS (inches)	48.400	72.800	21.890	23.230
EYE CONTACT (Sec.)	122.700	95.100	23.300	24.280
VERBOSITY (Sec.)	458.900	351.800	283.090	118.360
POSTURAL OPENNESS				
AMOUNT OF OPENNESS	4.113	3.415	1.187	.698
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHANGES	8.700	4.450	8.860	3.690

TABLE V

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR OSGOOD SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIALS

Measures	Mean		Standard Deviation	
	Confident	Diffident	Confident	Diffident
POTENCY	16.350	9.000	4.068	3.286
ACTIVITY	17.350	14.250	2.013	2.003
EVALUATION	20.950	22.300	3.335	1.819

TABLE VI

BEHAVIORAL MEASURE t-TESTS

Measures	t Values
STANDING PS	5.79**
SEATED PS	2.294*
EYE CONTACT	2.461
VERBOSITY	1.047
POSTURAL OPENNESS	
AMOUNT OF OPENNESS	1.519
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHANGES	1.332

* Significant at .05 level ($t_{critical}$ for .05 = 1.734).

**Significant at .01 level ($t_{critical}$ for .01 = 2.552).

TABLE VII

OSGOOD SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
t-TESTS

Measures	t Values
POTENCY	4.217**
ACTIVITY	3.273**
EVALUATION	1.067

**Significant at .01 level ($t_{critical}$ for .05 = 1.734).
($t_{critical}$ for .01 = 2.552).

Results from Standing Personal Space (PS), Seated PS, and Eye Contact conformed to predictions. The Confident group approached much closer on the Standing PS measure; the difference between the Confident and Diffident groups was highly significant (beyond the .01 level). Similarly, for Seated PS, the Confident group approached more closely; the difference between the groups was significant beyond the .05 level. The Confident group evidenced a significantly greater proportion of Eye Contact; the difference between the groups was significant at the .05 level. On the remaining behavioral dependent variables, the differences between means of the two groups were in the predicted direction, but did not reach significance. On the Verbosity measure there was a large difference in means. The Confident group spoke an average 458.9 seconds, compared to an average of 351.8 seconds for the Diffident group. However, there was a great deal of variability within groups, and the t-test did not reach significance. Postural Openness data were analyzed both

for the amount of openness and for the total number of times an individual changed positions. On the Amount of Openness, the t-test for a difference between the two groups slightly missed significance at the .05 level (it was significant at the .07 level); $\underline{t}$ calculated was 1.519, while t critical was 1.734. Regarding the Total Number of Changes in Posture, the Confident mean was 8.70, compared to the Diffident mean of 4.45. The $\underline{t}$ value again closely approached the critical value, but was not significant at the .05 level (it was significant at .10 level).

On the Osgood semantic differentials, two of the three measures were highly supportive of experimental hypotheses. The Confident group was evaluated as both more Potent and more Active than the Diffident group. One-tailed t-tests of the differences were highly significant (beyond the .01 level) in both cases. Results from the Evaluation dimension did not support experimental predictions as the Confident group was not rated more favorably. The $\underline{t}$ value was only 1.067.

The judges' ratings for Overall Effectiveness did not conform to experimental predictions. The mean for the Confident group was 81.5 (s.d. = 8.91) and the mean for the Diffident group was 83.0 (s.d. = 7.94). The t-test for a difference yielded a value less than one.

A copy of all raw data on which these analyses were based was included in Appendix F.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

A major hypothesis of this study, that playing a confident role would lead to an enhancement of personal confidence, was supported by the results. Within the Confident role-playing group, the Security-Insecurity Inventory (SII) results, which measured a subject's subjective feelings of self-confidence, were significantly enhanced on the post-trial measurement. Further, when these same Confident SII post-trial results were compared to the Diffident group's SII post-trial results, the differences were highly significant. That is, not only did the Confident role-playing heighten self-confidence, but Diffident role-playing led to lessened self-confidence. However, unlike the Confident group, the amount of change from the pre-trial measure to the post-trial for the Diffident group was not sufficient to be considered statistically significant.

The finding that an individual's subjective feelings of self-confidence were significantly enhanced seems noteworthy for several reasons. First, the strength of the treatment which subjects received was not excessive. Although the impact was strengthened by combining much of what had proven effective in previous studies, the role-playing exercise was relatively short. Each subject participated for only thirty minutes and this period included learning about the experiment, "coaching" on the role, imaginal rehearsal, and the active participation.

It is expected that if the time spent with each subject were increased, the present results could be improved upon significantly. This should result particularly if a series of trials occurred with time in between to assimilate each experience. Second, the dependent variable used to pick up the difference in self-confidence, the Security-Insecurity Inventory, cannot be considered particularly sophisticated or sensitive. While studies have found it to be reliable and to correlate highly with similar measures, it consists only of a series of questions to be answered "Yes" or "No," and the version utilized here contained only forty items. A more extensive measurement of self-confidence, both Pre- and Post-, should better reveal any differences. Third, the subjects who participated in this experiment were selected for high role-playing ability, but were from an average college undergraduate population on perceived self-confidence. Therefore, many initially were near the top of the scale on this variable, and there was little possibility for significant enhancement. If subjects were selected from a clinical group with significant initial deficiencies in self-confidence, the end result might be still more dramatic.

Naturally, the finding of enhanced self-confidence measured a few minutes after the role-playing experience does not evidence permanent or even long-term improvement. As Gergen (1965) suggested, the findings may result simply from subjects having become sensitized to positive aspects of self already present. This implies that the treatment had no "true" effect on the subject. On the other hand, the possibility certainly exists that in the "real world," it is just this sensitization to positive aspects of self that enables certain individuals to feel and behave confidently. Another related comment on these results could be

that no genuine new "learning" has been demonstrated, but simply a more superficial "performance" change. While this may be accurate, a performance change, nevertheless, seems to be a necessary first step and was appropriate for this "one-shot" experimental setting. If this exercise were repeated and reinforced several times, basic laws of learning suggest the enhanced self-confidence could become relatively permanent.

The possibility that results were effected by demand characteristics deserves some attention. This is, since subjects had just been asked to role-play confident individuals, their answers on the post-trial questionnaire may have been influenced by attempts to comply with what they felt was expected. However, it was made very clear to subjects at the conclusion of the scene that the role-playing phase was over. When given the questionnaire, they were instructed that it was very important to describe their true feelings. More significantly, the non-verbal measures and judges' ratings, discussed below, were acquired without the subjects' knowledge. These comprised strong supportive evidence that the subjects' subjective experiences in the two groups were distinctly different. Finally, all other studies which have included self-report measures are vulnerable to this criticism. The present study was at least sensitive to this issue from start to finish, and attempts were made to negate demand effects. A possible alternative for a future study, assessing behavioral measures after debriefing, will be discussed below.

The fact that the Confident group improved significantly, while the group given the Diffident treatment did not decrease sufficiently to reach significance, deserves some consideration. Apparently, it is easier to increase confidence than to decrease it. Any explanations must be speculative but include the following: subjects asked to play a

confident role may have identified readily, while those asked to act diffidently may have maintained distance between self and the role; our cultural norms discourage the admittance of weakness or emotional insecurity, and although subjects in the Diffident group actually may have felt even less confident, they may have been defensive about admitting these feelings on the test; finally, while enhanced self-confidence seems generally adaptive, the healthy "normal" may have developed strong resistance to becoming or feeling diffident.

Results from other dependent variables also were very supportive of the experimental hypotheses. Again, these results contradict interpreting the above results as simply responses to demand characteristics. Five behavioral or non-verbal measures were attained during the role-playing exercise and without the subject's awareness. These measures were determined by experimental assistants who were not informed of experimental hypotheses, as suggested by Rosenthal (1966), to avoid biasing results by experimenter expectations. On all five measures, the two groups differed in the expected direction. On Standing Personal Space (PS), the difference was highly significant. On both Seated PS and on Eye Contact, the difference was significant. Postural Openness results just missed significance at the .05 level. On the Verbosity measure, there was a large difference in means, but because of extreme variability within groups, the t value did not approach significance.

It is believed that subjects were generally naive concerning how an extremely confident or diffident individual would behave on the above variables. No information of this nature was included in the prior briefing or "coaching" sessions, and no attention was directed to anything except what their conversation might be. Further, the subjects

were not aware that these measures were being taken; this was confirmed with debriefing questioning. Therefore, the differences on these measures evidence that there were real differences in the way subjects in the two groups role-played. These differences indicate that subjects were very "involved" in their task. This involvement was having an impact on their role-playing behavior of which they probably were not even aware. Since the role they were playing was having differential effects on their unconscious behavior, it can be inferred that the role-playing was also affecting their internal experiences. That is, subjects in the Confident group were not simply verbalizing confidently, but had assimilated much of the confident role; they had been affected by the role they were playing. The behavioral results generally lend additional support to the data reported from the SII measure. In addition, while used here as dependent variables to distinguish confident and diffident behavior, these results also contribute to the growing body of literature that indicates there are valid non-verbal indices of personality characteristics and emotional difficulties. In general, characteristics demonstrated by those in the Diffident group are not adaptive in our society. This is supported by the previously reviewed studies which found relationships between significant emotional problems and either high personal space or low eye contact. The manner in which these subjects intuitively assumed these roles and enacted differences between confidence and diffidence should be of interest to diagnosticians and psychotherapists.

A final group of measures, the judges' ratings of role-players, agreed fairly well with experimental predictions. The Confident group, relative to the Diffident group, was judged highly significantly

superior in Potency and in Activity. Contrary to predictions, there was no difference on either Evaluation or on Overall Effectiveness. Before rating each role-player, judges were informed of instructions given to the subject and about the role which was to be portrayed. With regard to Potency, Activity and Evaluation, they were asked to rate not the individual as he played the role, but rather "what that subject was really like, when not role-playing." Even though both groups initially were equal on self-confidence (and presumably on Potency and Activity), the judges were so affected by subjects' performances that they could not see them as equal. That is, even though judges were told that what they were seeing was just an act, it still had a highly significant effect on how they rated a subject's "true" (outside the role) Potency and Activity. Since the role subjects were playing influenced how they were perceived, this further evidences that role-players were very involved in their roles and that the roles were having considerable impact on their performance. Perhaps even more important, these results indicate differences between the two groups of subjects were perceived by their peers, and those who acted confidently were given more "socially approved" ratings. Levy and Atkins (1969) stated that any change in self-concept or behavior must be supported in the social environment. These data suggest that changes brought about by role-playing as described here might be detected, supported, and might persist, particularly if the treatment were repeated several times.

In this same vein, the general results of this study have obvious application in many psychotherapy situations. Although described in a variety of ways, e.g., low self-esteem, poor self-concept, ego-ideal discrepancy, and negative self-regard, the characteristic which has here

been termed low self-confidence is common to a very large proportion of individuals who need psychotherapy. Techniques which utilize at least some common features of role-playing a very confident individual, as in the present study, could have wide application. As previously mentioned, role-playing seems particularly useful with certain patients who might be unable to profit from insight-oriented psychotherapy, perhaps because of low intelligence or poor verbal skills. Other patients who might benefit would be those psychiatrically hospitalized in a short-term or crisis-oriented treatment ward, for whom a more "uncovering" approach might be detrimental. In addition, many others in our society who might not need or desire psychotherapy, e.g., psychotherapists or teachers in training, might be aided by a technique of this sort which could quickly enhance their self-confidence. As either patients or trainees made improvements, their progress could be monitored and quantified with the non-verbal measures utilized in this study.

Regarding follow-up research suggested by this study, there seem to be several possibilities. The non-verbal measures of self-confidence served to confirm subjects' subjective reports in this study. However, these were measured while the role-played scene was taking place. To better determine after-effects on subjects who played a confident or diffident role, these measures could be acquired during or following the debriefing, again without the subject's awareness. Significant differences at this stage would better demonstrate that a genuine effect had occurred. Further, this would negate the possibility of attributing differences on the self-report questionnaire to effects of demand characteristics. Another follow-up possibility might include duplicating the present experiment three times while selectively removing either

(1) improvisation by the subject, (2) active, verbal participation, or (3) emotional involvement. All three were believed important to achieving the significant results reported here, but one might be shown to be more important than the others. If this were so, any use of the present technique in therapy might be designed to emphasize or better develop that effect for maximum results. Finally, as present results apply only to females, it would be useful to repeat the present study with male subjects and/or male assistants playing the role of teachers during the interaction.

With regard to previous related research, present results were consistent with studies presented in the review, particularly Gergen (1965) and Gergen and Gibbs (1965). While containing similarities to these studies and to others reviewed, the present study was unique in: attempting specifically to alter confidence-diffidence; taking demand characteristics and experimenter bias into account and in attempting to offset these; utilizing effect-enhancing role-playing techniques from the attitude change literature in a more "applied" and potentially psychotherapeutic application; including a variety of dependent variables, particularly unobtrusive non-verbal measures, to ascertain differences between treatment groups. As a psychotherapeutic technique, this methodology has features similar to "assertive training" as described by Wolpe (1969). However, in contrast to Wolpe's methods, this approach was not dependent on passively imagining a scene, and thus on the subject's individual talent for imagery. In this case, "props" and a "set" were utilized. The subject was actively participating and emotionally involved in a dialogue with another role-playing individual. As there is more verisimilitude in this setting, it seems possible there

would be more generalization to "real-life" situations.

In summary, this study found a significant enhancement in self-confidence following the performance of a confident role. It appears this effect easily could be enhanced and strengthened by utilizing stronger treatment effects and/or an initially less confident population. Behavioral data and judges' ratings evidenced several significant differences between the two groups and thus supported the self-reports of differences in self-confidence between the two groups. Possible therapeutic applications and follow-up studies were presented.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Previous studies have found that when an individual played the role of holding a particular opinion, as in a debate, his personal opinion became more similar to that which he role-played. However, most of the opinions which have been changed in this manner have been external to the role-player. The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of confident and diffident role-playing on the role-player's personal self-confidence or feelings of self. Behavioral indices of this role-playing and the perceptions others received of the role-player were also investigated.

One group was assigned to a very Confident role and another to a very Diffident role. Since improvisation, emotional and active involvement, and positive incentives have been found to enhance changes in role-playing, this study's design made use of these factors. Each subject individually role-played a scene with an experimental assistant, and completed a forty-item evaluation of self-confidence. This measure was compared to an identical one attained in a class a few weeks before the experiment. In addition, video-tapes were made of each role-playing, and judges evaluated each subject on several behavioral variables and rated her perceived personality.

After the role-playing, the subjective feelings of self-confidence of the Confident group were greater than those of the Diffident group,

and the difference was highly significant. Further, within the Confident group, post-trial self-confidence became greater than pre-trial self-confidence, and the difference was statistically significant. Within the Diffident group, post-trial self-confidence was less than the pre-trial measure, but the difference did not reach significance. These results were considered noteworthy since self-confidence was significantly enhanced for the Confident group with only a single, thirty-minute exercise and since the subjects' self-confidence already was moderately high when the experiment began.

On the behavioral indices, differences between the two groups all were in the predicted direction; one measure was highly significant, two were significant, and two others were marginally significant. These results evidenced: the validity of behavioral indices to distinguish confidence and diffidence; that subjects were "involved" in the role-playing; and that there were genuine quantifiable differences in the method of enacting these two roles.

On the judges' perceptions of the role-players' "true" personalities (outside the role), differences between the groups were highly significant on two of the three dimensions. Although judges were told that what they were seeing was just a performance, they still evaluated the personalities of those who played a Confident role as more Potent and more Active. These results support those from the previous self-perceptions and behavioral data and further evidence that there were genuine differences in the manner in which the two groups enacted their roles.

In conclusion, it appears that role-playing a confident role can enhance an individual's subjective feelings of self-confidence.

Differences between confident and diffident role-players are not restricted to their subjective feelings, however, and also can be determined behaviorally and by judges' ratings. These results should be relevant for psychotherapists or for anyone with an interest in enhancing self-confidence.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altmann, S.A.

1967 "The Structure of Primate Communication." In S. A. Altmann (Ed.) Social Communication Among Privates. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Argyle, M.

1969 Social Interaction. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton Press.

Booraem, C. D. and J. V. Flowers.

1972 "Reduction of Anxiety and Personal Space as a Function of Assertion Training with Severely Disturbed Neuropsychiatric Inpatients." Psychological Reports, 30, 923-929.

Boylin, E. R.

1971 "Using Psychodrama to Introduce A New Drug Addict to Members of a Concept House: A Case Study." Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama, 24, 31-33.

Butt, D. S. and D. W. Fiske.

1968 "Comparison of Strategies in Developing Scales for Dominance." Psychological Bulletin, 70, 505-519.

Cautela, J. R.

1969 "Behavior Therapy and Self-control: Techniques and Implications." In C. M. Frank's (Ed.) The Assessment and Status of the Behavior Therapies and Associated Developments. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chance, M. R.

1962 "The Interpretation of Some Agonistic Postures." Symposium of the Zoological Society of London, 8, 71-89.

Cranach, M. L.

1971 "Orienting Behavior in Human Interaction." In A. H. Esser (Ed.) Behavior and Environment. New York: Plenum Press.

Dosey, M. A. and M. Meisels.

1969 "Personal Space and Self-protection." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 11, 93-97.

Duke, M. P. and S. Nowicki.

1972 "A New Measure and Social-learning Model for Interpersonal Distance." Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 6, 119-132.

Duke, M. P. and M. C. Mullins.

1973 "Preferred Interpersonal Distance as a Function of Locus of Control Orientation in Chronic Schizophrenics, Nonschizophrenic Patients, and Normals." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41, 230-234.

Eberts, E. H.

1972 "Social and Personality Correlates of Personal Space." In W. J. Mitchell (Ed.), Environmental design: Research and Practice. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Elms, A. C.

1966 "Influence of Fantasy Ability on Attitude Change Through Role Playing." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 36-43.

Exline, R. V. and L. C. Winters.

1965 "Affective Relations and Mutual Glances in Dyads." In S. Tompkins and C. Izard (Eds.), Affect, Cognition and Personality. New York: Springer.

Friedman, P. H.

1969 "The Effects of Modeling and Role-playing on Assertive Behavior." Dissertation Abstracts, 29, 4844-4845.

Friendman, S.

1970 " Role-playing in a Youth Employment Office." Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama, 23, 21-26.

Fromme, D. K. and D. C. Beam.

1974 "Dominance and Sex Differences in Nonverbal Responses to Differential Eye Contact." Journal of Research in Personality, 8, 76-87.

Gergen, K. J.

1965 "The Effects of Interaction Goals and Personalistic Feedback on the Presentation of Self." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 413,424.

Gergen, K. J. and M. S. Gibbs.

1965 "Role-playing and Modifying the Self-concept." Paper presented at 1965 meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association.

Goffman, E.

1959 The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday.

Gough, H. G.

1948 "A Note on The Security-Insecurity Test." Journal of Social Psychology, 28, 257-261.

Greenwald, A. G. and R. D. Albert.

1968 "Acceptance and Recall of Improvised Arguments." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8, 31-34.

Hays, W. L.

1963 Statistics for Psychologists. New York, N. Y.: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Homme, L. E.

1965 "Perspectives in Psychology: XXIV Control of Coverants, the Operants of the Mind." The Psychological Records, 15, 501-511.

Horowitz, M. J.

1968 "Spatial Behavior and Psychopathology." Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 146, 24-35.

Janis, I. L. and B. T. King.

1954 "The Influence of Role-playing on Opinion Change." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49, 211-218.

Janis, I. L. and J. B. Gilmore.

1965 "The Influence of Incentive Conditions on the Success of Role-playing in Modifying Attitudes." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 17-27.

Janis, I. L. and L. Mann.

1965 "Effectiveness of Emotional Role-playing in Modifying Smoking Habits and Attitudes." Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1, 84-90.

Jones, M. J.

1969 "Role-playing as an Educational and Training Device in a Poverty-oriented Multiracial Group." Group Psychotherapy, 22, 195-201.

Kelman, H. C.

1953 "Attitude Change as Function of Response Restriction." Human Relations, 6, 185-214.

Keutzer, C. S., E. Lichtenstein, and K. Hines.

1969 "'Emotional' Role-playing and Changes in Smoking Attitudes and Behavior." Proceedings of the 77th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 4, 373-374.

King, B. T. and I. L. Janis

1956 "Comparison of the Effectiveness of Improvised Versus Non-improvised Role-playing in Producing Opinion Change." Human Relations, 9, 177-186.

Kirk, R. E.

1968 Experimental Design: Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 245-318.

Krumboltz, J. D. and C. E. Thoreson (Editors).

1969 Behavioral Counseling: Cases and Techniques. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 79-80.

Leshner, M.

1967 "Attitude Change: A Comparison Study of Multiple Role-playing and Group Discussion under Conditions of Effort, Exposure, and Direction." Dissertation Abstracts, 28 (B), 1166-1167.

Levy, S. J. and A. Atkins.

1969 "Role-playing, Emotional Arousal, and Latitudes of Acceptance: Attitude toward Interfaith Marriage." Proceedings of the 77th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 4, 377-378.

Luft, J.

1966 "On Non-verbal Interaction." Journal of Psychology, 63, 261-268.

Mann, L.

1967 "The Effects of Emotional Role-playing on Desire to Modify Smoking Habits." Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 3, 334-348.

Mann, L. and I. L. Janis.

1968 "A Follow-up Study on the Long-term Effects of Emotional Role-playing." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8, 339-342.

Marlowe, D. and K. J. Gergen.

1969 "Personality and Social Interaction." In G. Lindsey and E. Aronson's (Editors) Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 3, 590-665.

Maslow, A. H., E. Birsh, M. Stein, and I. Honigmann.

1945 "A Clinically Derived Test for Measuring Psychological Security-Insecurity." Journal of General Psychology, 33, 21-41.

Matefy, R. E.

1973 "Attitude Change Induced By Role Playing as A Function of Improvisation and Role-taking Skill." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24, 343-350.

Mehrabian, A.

1968 "Relationship of Attitude to Seated Posture, Orientation, and Distance." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 26-30.

1971 "Verbal and Nonverbal Interaction of Strangers in a Waiting Situation." Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 5, 127-128.

Newburger, D.

1970 "Role Training in Speech Classes at a Metropolitan Community College under Open Admissions." Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama, 23, 27-29.

Osgood, C. E., S. J. Suci, and P. H. Tannenbann.

1957 The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Patterson, M. L. and D. S. Holmes.

1966 "Social Interaction Correlates of the MPI Extroversion-introversion Scale." American Psychologist, 21, 724-725.

Patterson, M. L. and L. B. Sechrest.

1970 "Interpersonal Distance and Impression Formation." Journal of Personality, 38, 161-166.

Poling, T.

1974 "Proxemic and Kinesic Behavior." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Oklahoma State University.)

Porter, E., M. Argyle, and V. Salter.

1970 "What Is Signalled by Proximity?" Perceptual and Motor Skills, 30, 39-42.

Rodgers, L. A.

1969 "The Effect of Role-playing on Student Attitudes toward High School Counselors and Guidance." Dissertation Abstracts, 29 (A), 3840-3841.

Rosenfeld, H. M.

1965 "Effect of an Approval-seeking Induction on Interpersonal Proximity." Psychological Reports, 17, 120-122.

Rosenthal, R.

1966 Experimental Effects in Behavioral Research. New York, N. Y.: Appleton - Century - Crofts, 367-379.

Sanders, B. D.

1968 "Behavior Rehearsal and Imaginal Desensitization in Reducing Public Speaking Anxiety." Dissertation Abstracts, 28, 3065-3066.

Schaeffer, D. T. and R. Von Nessen.

1968 "Intervention for Disadvantaged Girls: Insight for School Faculties." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 38 (4), 666-671.

Siroka, E.

1968 "Spontaneity Theatre as an Aid to Emotional Education." Journal of Emotional Education, 8, 212-219.

Sommer, R.

1969 Personal Space: The Behavioral Basis for Design. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Strongman, K. T. and B. G. Champness.

1968 "Dominance, Hierarchies and Conflict in Eye Contact." Acta Psychologica, 28, 276-286.

Watts, W. A.

1967 "Relative Persistence of Opinion Change Induced by Active Compared to Passive Participation." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 4-15.

Wolf, S. and R. C. Hall.

1971 "The Use of Psychodrama to Diminish Trans-cultural Distance in Psychotherapy." Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama, 24, 17-23.

Wolpe, J.

1969 The Practice of Behavior Therapy. Elmsford, N. Y.: Pergamon Press, Inc., 61-71.

APPENDIX A

ELM'S EMPATHIC FANTASY SCALE (EFS)

1. When I read an interesting story or novel, I imagine how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me.

(Circle one # on each question)

extremely true	moderately true	neutral or undecided	moderately false	extremely false
1	2	3	4	5

2. When I see strangers, I almost never try to imagine what they are thinking.

1 2 3 4 5

3. I like to imagine myself as being various different types of person.

1 2 3 4 5

4. I usually feel that I know exactly what mood my friends are in, even when nothing is said in words.

1 2 3 4 5

5. I find it hard to imagine how a poor Southern Negro feels about white people.

1 2 3 4 5

6. It's hard for me to act as if I'm a different kind of person than I really am.

1 2 3 4 5

7. After acting in a play myself, or seeing a play or movie, I have felt partly as though I were one of the characters.

1 2 3 4 5

8. When I disagree with a person, I do not try to feel in my own mind the reason why the person holds an opinion different from mine.

1 2 3 4 5

9. I often try to guess what people are thinking, before they tell me.

1 2 3 4 5

10. A person can't really know what is going on inside someone else's head.

1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX B

MASLOW'S SECURITY-INSECURITY INVENTORY (SII)

Do not mark on this sheet. Mark your answers on the computer card. Please use only a No. 2 pencil for this purpose. Make your marks heavy and black. If you decide to change an answer, be sure to erase completely. If your answer is Yes, blacken the A space on the card. If your answer is No, blacken the B space.

Your answers will be strictly confidential.

1. Do you ordinarily like to be with people rather than alone? A. Yes B. No
2. Do you have social ease? A. Yes B. No
3. Do you lack self-confidence? A. Yes B. No
4. Do you often have a feeling of resentment against the world?
5. Do you think people like you as much as they do others?
6. Do you worry too long over humiliating experiences?
7. Can you be comfortable with yourself?
8. Do you often have a feeling of loneliness even when you are with people?
9. Do you feel that you are getting a square deal in life?
10. When your friends criticize you, do you usually take it well?
11. Do you get discouraged easily?
12. Do you usually feel friendly toward most people?
13. Are you generally optimistic?
14. Do you consider yourself a rather nervous person?
15. Are you in general a happy person?
16. Are you ordinarily quite sure of yourself?
17. Are you often self-conscious?
18. Do you tend to be dissatisfied with yourself?
19. Are you frequently in low spirits?
20. When you meet people for the first time do you usually feel they will not like you?
21. Do you have enough faith in yourself?
22. Do you feel that you are useful in the world?
23. Do you ordinarily get on well with others?
24. Do you spend much time worrying about the future?
25. Do you usually feel well and strong?
26. Are you a good conversationalist?
27. Do you have difficulty in expressing your feelings?
28. Do you often feel left out of things?
29. Do you ordinarily think of the world as a nice place to live in?
30. Do you get upset easily?
31. Do you feel that you are living as you please rather than as someone else pleases?
32. Do you feel that you are not satisfactorily adjusted to life?
33. Do you ordinarily proceed on the assumption that things usually tend to turn out all right?
34. Are you troubled with feelings of inferiority?
35. Do you generally feel "good?"
36. Do you get along well with the opposite sex?
37. Are you easily hurt?
38. Do you generally put others at their ease?
39. Do you have a vague fear of the future?
40. Do you behave naturally?

APPENDIX C

OUTLINE FOR PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCE

Pretend You Have Come to the Teacher's Office for a Conference About Your Child

(Possible Outline -- All these points need not be covered, or you might think of others you would rather talk about.)

1. Introduce Yourself.

2. General discussion of all the things you are pleased or displeased about.

   You might discuss:

   a. subjects being taught
   b. method of teaching
   c. method of discipline
   d. the other children -- their relation to your child

3. Previous teachers -- Their good and bad points -- how they helped or hindered your child.

4. Overall goals you would like to see your child achieve -- Both in personality areas and in vocational or academic areas.

5. Conclude session -- Goodbye.

APPENDIX D

POSTURAL OPENNESS RATING SHEET

Subject # _____

Grader _____

Directions: Beginning with the first position visible on the monitor, mark one score for arms and one for legs and begin timing. As soon as either legs or arms positions change, record total time for the previous position. Then go to the next numbered blank (below) and record the score for that position. If only arms or only legs position changes, a new score need not be entered for the part which remains unchanged. Use a new sheet for each subject

---

SCORING CRITERIA

ARMS

1 - Arms interlocked across front of the body.
2 - Both arms folded across front of the body (if arms are folded, they are not interlocked).
2 - Both hands joined in front of the body.
2 - Hands placed in such a way in lap as if to protect the genital area (hands need not be touching).
3 - Only one hand or arm folded across the front of the body.
3 - One arm folded across the front of the body resting in the subject's lap, the hand of which supports the elbow of the other arm. In such a case, the chin rests in the hand of the supported arm.
4 - Neither arm was folded across the front of the body.

LEGS

1 - One foot on the floor and one leg propped upon the other at the knees with the thighs touching.
2 - Both feet resting on the floor and the knees together.
3 - The ankle of one leg rests upon the knee of the other, leaving the thighs separated.
4 - Both feet rest on the floor and the knees and thighs held apart.

	Arms			Legs	
	Score	Time in this position		Score	Time in this position
1.	_____	_____	1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	2.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	3.	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	4.	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	5.	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	6.	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____	7.	_____	_____

APPENDIX E

OSGOOD SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIALS AND OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS

Your name_____

Subject #_____

Please rate the individual you have just observed on the following traits. Please do not be careless; your true impressions are most important to this study.

	Extremely	Mod	Sltly	Neutral or Undec	Sltly	Mod	Extremely	
Unable								Able
Convincing								Unconvincing
Ineffective								Effective
Hard								Soft
Cautious								Rash
Bad								Good
Active								Passive
Dishonest								Honest
Progressive								Regressive
Stable								Changeable
Weak								Strong
Calm								Excitable
Harmful								Beneficial
Kind								Cruel
Severe								Lenient

Now give the subject a percentage grade for the overall role-playing task.

For example, <u>excellent</u> work might receive a score in the 90's, <u>good</u> work a score in the 80's, <u>average</u> work a score in the 70's, <u>poor</u> work a score in the 60's, <u>very poor</u> work a score in the 50's.

APPENDIX F

RAW DATA

Data from Maslow's Security-Insecurity Inventory (SII)

	Subject #	Pre-trial	Post-trial
Confident Group	1.	33	31
	3.	32	33
	5.	36	39
	7.	25	28
	9.	32	39
	11.	38	36
	13.	31	38
	15.	24	24
	17.	30	31
	19.	22	29
		mean = 30.3	mean = 32.8
		s.d. = 4.92	s.d. = 4.85
		n = 10	n = 10
Diffident Group	2.	35	32
	4.	11	9
	6.	35	36
	8.	34	36
	10.	28	22
	12.	32	28
	14.	33	33
	16.	32	34
	18.	27	27
	20.	31	25
		mean = 29.8	mean = 28.2
		s.d. = 7.13	s.d. = 8.24
		n = 10	n = 10

Data from Assistant's Judgment of Standing Personal Space (PS)

	Subject #	Judgment (in inches)
Confident Group	1.	54
	3.	66
	5.	24
	7.	54
	9.	48
	11.	24
	13.	42
	15.	42
	17.	54
	19.	78
		mean = 48.6
		s.d. = 16.00
		n = 10
Diffident Group	2.	90
	4.	126
	6.	108
	8.	138
	10.	90
	12.	90
	14.	54
	16.	132
	18.	126
	20.	96
		mean = 105.0
		s.d. = 24.62
		n = 10

Data from Assistant's Measurement of Seated Personal Space (PS)

	Subject #	Measurement (in inches)
Confident Group	1.	43
	3.	32
	5.	44
	7.	92
	9.	36
	11.	89
	13.	48
	15.	39
	17.	35
	29.	26
		mean = 48.4
		s.d. = 21.89
		n = 10
Diffident Group	2.	91
	4.	92
	6.	92
	8.	56
	10.	58
	12.	26
	14.	92
	16.	84
	18.	45
	20.	92
		mean = 72.8
		s.d. = 23.23
		n = 10

Data from the Two Judges' Ratings of Eye Contact (EC)
(Number of seconds of EC during first 180 seconds of interview)

	Subject #	Rating of Judge 1	Rating of Judge 2	Mean Rating
Confident Group	1.	110	98	104
	3.	146	147	146
	5.	84	85	84
	7.	121	123	122
	9.	126	138	132
	11.	110	106	108
	13.	128	129	128
	15.	114	120	117
	17.	114	114	114
	19.	170	174	172
				mean = 122.7
				s.d. = 23.30
				n = 10
Diffident Group	2.	76	78	77
	4.	93	89	91
	6.	77	79	78
	8.	94	81	87
	10.	112	113	112
	12.	77	67	72
	14.	148	148	148
	16.	93	85	89
	18.	68	75	71
	20.	126	126	126
				mean = 95.1
				s.d. = 24.28
				n = 10

Correlation between judges:
Pearson r = .98

Data from the Two Judges' Ratings of Postural Openness - Amount of Openness

	Subject #	Rating of Judge 1	Rating of Judge 2	Mean Rating
Confident Group	1.	3.013	3.013	3.013
	3.	3.013	3.013	3.013
	5.	3.107	3.223	3.165
	7.	3.909	4.005	3.957
	9.	4.028	4.028	4.028
	11.	4.020	4.223	4.122
	13.	5.690	7.462	6.576
	15.	6.143	6.117	6.130
	17.	4.023	3.023	3.523
	19.	3.577	3.620	3.598
				mean = 4.113
				s.d. = 1.187
				n = 10
Diffident Group	2.	3.008	3.008	3.008
	4.	2.757	3.036	2.896
	6.	4.395	4.260	4.327
	8.	3.863	4.134	3.999
	10.	3.083	3.053	3.068
	12.	4.000	4.000	4.000
	14.	4.793	3.817	4.295
	16.	4.004	3.004	3.504
	18.	3.003	3.003	3.003
	20.	2.053	2.053	2.053
				mean = 3.415
				s.d. = .698
				n = 10

Correlation between judges:
Pearson r = .88

Data from the Two Judges' Ratings of Postural Openness - Number of Changes

	Subject #	Rating of Judge 1	Rating of Judge 2	Mean Rating
Confident Group	1.	8	8	8
	3.	4	4	4
	5.	33	33	33
	7.	2	2	2
	9.	2	2	2
	11.	5	4	4.5
	13.	3	3	3
	15.	12	12	12
	17.	7	9	8
	19.	11	12	11.5
				mean = 8.8
				s.d. = 8.86
				n = 10
Diffident Group	2.	4	4	4
	4.	6	7	6.5
	6.	4	4	4
	8.	3	3	3
	10.	12	12	12
	12.	0	0	0
	14.	10	10	10
	16.	2	2	2
	18.	2	2	2
	20.	2	2	2
				mean = 4.5
				s.d. = 3.69
				n = 10

Correlation between judges:
Pearson r = .88

Data from Assistant's Measurement of Verbosity
(Total time of interview in seconds)

	Subject #	Measurement
Confident Group	1.	1048
	3.	461
	5.	749
	7.	231
	9.	216
	11.	758
	13.	132
	15.	247
	17.	332
	19.	415
	mean =	458.9
	s.d. =	283.09
	n =	10
Diffident Group	2.	243
	4.	407
	6.	185
	8.	356
	10.	372
	12.	222
	14.	619
	16.	309
	18.	373
	20.	432
	mean =	351.8
	s.d. =	118.36
	n =	10

Data from the Two Judges' Ratings of Potency
(One of the Osgood semantic differentials)

	Subject #	Rating of Judge 1	Rating of Judge 2	Mean Rating
Confident Group	1.	18	12	15
	3.	16	14	15
	5.	13	18	15.5
	7.	12	13	12.5
	9.	9	9	9
	11.	22	12	17
	13.	13	22	17.5
	15.	15	17	16
	17.	24	24	24
	19.	24	20	22
				mean = 16.35
				s.d. = 4.068
				n = 10
Diffident Group	2.	7	5	6
	4.	10	4	7
	6.	6	8	7
	8.	7	7	7
	10.	17	14	15.5
	12.	6	5	5.5
	14.	10	4	7
	16.	13	13	13
	18.	10	9	9.5
	20.	14	11	12.5
				mean = 9.0
				s.d. = 3.286
				n = 10

Correlation between judges:
Pearson r = .74

Data from the Two Judges' Ratings of Activity
(One of the Osgood semantic differentials)

	Subject #	Rating of Judge 1	Rating of Judge 2	Mean Rating
Confident Group	1.	19	19	19
	3.	19	16	17.5
	5.	15	15	15
	7.	15	13	14
	9.	17	15	16
	11.	16	16	16
	13.	23	18	20.5
	15.	16	23	19.5
	17.	18	20	19
	19.	17	17	17
				mean = 17.35
				s.d. = 2.013
				n = 10
Diffident Group	2.	13	15	14
	4.	12	13	12.5
	6.	18	11	14.5
	8.	11	11	11
	10.	18	13	15.5
	12.	14	11	12.5
	14.	16	17	16.5
	16.	15	17	16
	18.	13	12	12.5
	20.	21	14	17.5
				mean = 14.25
				s.d. = 2.003
				n = 10

Correlation between judges:
Pearson r = .41

Data from the Two Judges' Ratings of Evaluation
(One of the Osgood semantic differentials)

	Subject #	Rating of Judge 1	Rating of Judge 2	Mean Rating
Confident Group	1.	21	22	21.5
	3.	16	22	19
	5.	27	26	26.5
	7.	23	24	23.5
	9.	23	25	24
	11.	15	20	17.5
	13.	16	14	15
	15.	24	22	23
	17.	17	19	18
	19.	21	22	21.5
				mean = 20.95
				s.d. = 3.335
				n = 10
Diffident Group	2.	25	23	24
	4.	26	24	25
	6.	21	22	21.5
	8.	24	24	24
	10.	24	23	23.5
	12.	20	23	21.5
	14.	18	25	21.5
	16.	22	24	23
	18.	19	21	20
	20.	18	20	19
				mean = 22.3
				s.d. = 1.819
				n = 10

Correlation between judges:
Pearson r = .68

Data from the Two Judges' Ratings of Overall Effectiveness
(Based on percentage ratings)

	Subject #	Rating of Judge 1	Rating of Judge 2	Mean Rating
Confident Group	1.	85	81	83
	3.	78	84	81
	5.	89	90	89.5
	7.	80	76	78
	9.	78	74	76
	11.	78	70	74
	13.	58	68	63
	15.	85	85	85
	17.	91	88	89.5
	19.	95	97	96
				mean = 81.5
				s.d. = 8.91
				n = 10
Diffident Group	2.	98	86	92
	4.	88	83	85.5
	6.	62	80	71
	8.	82	88	85
	10.	86	72	79
	12.	68	75	71.5
	14.	97	90	93.5
	16.	75	82	78.5
	18.	92	95	93.5
	20.	80	81	80.5
				mean = 83.0
				s.d. = 7.94
				n = 10

Correlation between judges:
Pearson r = .69

Data from First Phase with Elm's Empathic Fantasy Scale (EFS)

Range = 15 - 47

Overall Mean = 34.517
n = 215

Male Mean = 34.088
n = 87

Female Mean = 34.579
n = 128

VITA

John Kenneth Reid

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: EFFECTS OF CONFIDENT AND DIFFIDENT ROLE-PLAYING ON SELF-EVALUATION, PERCEIVED EVALUATION, AND BEHAVIORAL MEASURES

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Kansas City, Missouri, May 30, 1945, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth M. Reid.

Education: Attended grade school in Blackwell, Oklahoma; graduated from Blackwell High School in 1963; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma State University in May, 1967, with a major in Psychology; received the Master of Science degree from Oklahoma State University in 1971 with a major in Psychology; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Psychology in July, 1975.

Professional Experience: Psychological assistant, State of Oklahoma, Department of Public Welfare, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1970-1972; graduate teaching assistantship, OSU, 1973-1974; administrative assistant, OSU Psychology Guidance Center, Summer, 1974; internship in clinical psychology, University of Texas Health Sciences Center, San Antonio, Texas, 1974-1975.